

Remarks

Claims 1-21 were originally presented for examination. In the Office Action dated March 20, 2006, claims 1-4, 7, 20 and 21 were rejected, and claims 5, 6, and 8-19 were objected to but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The limitations of claims allowable claim 5 and 2 and 4 were incorporated into claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 8-19 were canceled. The limitations of allowable claim 8 were combined with claims 1, 2, and 4 to arrive at new claim 22 along with new dependent claims 23-28. The limitations of allowable claim 12 were combined with claim 1 to arrive at new claim 29 along with new claims 30-38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by the patent to Kuan (6,762,751). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 5 and intervening claims 2 and 4. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from claim 1 as amended. It is believed that claim 1 as amended and its dependent claims are therefore now in a condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuan in view of the patent to Tooi (5,448,023). Furthermore, claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuan in view of the published patent application of Sun et al. (US 2004/0095322). Claim 7 now depends from claim 1 as amended herein to include the limitations of allowable claim 5. Likewise, claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 1 as amended herein. Other claims have been amended to provide correct dependency. It is believed that claims 7 and 20-21 therefore now in a condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 5, 6 and 8-19 but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claims

and any independent claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 5 and the corresponding intervening claims. Likewise, new claim 22 corresponds to the limitations of claim 1 in combination with the limitations of claim 8 and the corresponding intervening claims, and new claim 29 corresponds to the limitations of claim 1 in combination with the limitations of claim 12. The dependent claims of claims 1, 22 and 29 correspond to their respective embodiments from the original claim set as filed. It is therefore believed that claims 1, 3, 6-7, and 20-38 are now in a condition for allowance.

It is noted that claimed subject matter may be patentably distinguished from the cited patent for additional reasons; however, the foregoing is believed to be sufficient. Likewise, it is noted that the Assignee's failure to comment directly upon any of the positions asserted by the Examiner in the office action does not indicate agreement or acquiescence with those asserted positions.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested. Reconsideration of the present patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested. Please charge any underpayments or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3703.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, Kenneth J. Cool, at (503) 439-6500 if there remains any issue with allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE

Date: June 14, 2006

/Kenneth J. Cool - Reg. No. 40,570/

Kenneth J. Cool
Reg. No. 40,570

Customer No. 43831
Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLC
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006
Phone: 503.439.6500